

REMARKS

Applicants have amended Claims 1 and 12. Support for these claim amendments can be found in the original Specification on page 7, lines 25-26, and in Figure 4. Thus, the amendments to Claims 1 and 12 do not add new matter.

Claims 1, 6-10, 13 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 5,644,415 to Aoki et al. in view of United States Patent No. 5,936,693 to Yoshida et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of the present invention. More specifically, neither the Aoki et al. reference or the Yoshida et al. reference discloses or suggests a liquid crystal display wherein, *inter alia*, "the low effective voltage area has an effective voltage decreasing slit, formed on at least one of the electrodes," as defined in amended independent Claim 1. Additionally, with regard to independent Claim 6, neither of the cited references discloses or suggests a liquid crystal display with, *inter alia*, a low effective voltage area in which "the area ratio of the low effective voltage area to the total area of each pixel region is in the range from 0.6 to 0.8."

First, with regard to independent Claim 1, the Examiner correctly acknowledged that the Aoki et al. reference and the Yohida et al. reference fail to disclose that the low effective voltage area has an electrode portion with "blanks" (which was a term originally found in (now-cancelled) dependent Claim 11, and which, in amended Claim 1, has been replaced by the term "effective voltage decreasing slit"). *See* December 11, 2006

Office Action, page 8 (lines 19-21). Accordingly, in the rejection of now-cancelled dependent Claim 11, the Examiner relied upon United States Patent Application Publication No. 202/0075436 to Kubo et al. However, the Kubo et al. reference lacks any disclosure or suggestion of the claimed "effective voltage decreasing slit," now recited in amended independent Claim 1. More specifically, element 14a of Kubo et al., which the Examiner equated with the "blanks" of now-cancelled dependent Claim 11, is an orientation-regulating structure. *See* Kubo et al., paragraphs [0103], [0138] - [0139] and [0141]. The Kubo et al. reference fails to disclose that element 14a is an "effective voltage decreasing slit." Thus, the Kubo et al. reference fails to disclose or suggest that the claimed low effective voltage area has an effective voltage decreasing slit, formed on at least one of the electrodes, as defined in amended independent Claim 1. Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection of independent Claim 1 and associated dependent Claims 7-10, 13 and 14.

Second, with regard to independent Claim 6, Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest a liquid crystal display with, *inter alia*, a low effective voltage area in which "the area ratio of the low effective voltage area to the total area of each pixel region is in the range from 0.6 to 0.8." As correctly acknowledged by the Examiner, the Aoki et al. reference fails to disclose that the area ratio of the low effective voltage area to the total area of each pixel region is in the range from 0.6 to 0.8. Accordingly, the Examiner relied upon the Yoshida et al. reference. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the Yoshida et al. reference actually teaches away from using ratios

other than those between 0.3 to 0.5 (i.e., 30% to 50%). The Yoshida et al. reference discloses that tests were conducted in which the ratio of surface area of the low voltage area to the total surface area is between 30% and 70% (*see e.g.*, Table 1 of Column 8). However, the Yoshida et al. reference then concludes that the optimum value for the ratio is between 30 and 50%. *See* Column 10, lines 46-51. Applicants respectfully submit that one looking at this reference to modify another reference would only utilize the optimum values (30-50%), and would not have utilized other values that the Yoshida et al. reference tested, but deemed inadequate. Thus, Applicants submits that the Yoshida et al. reference teaches away from values of greater than 50% (i.e., 0.5). Accordingly, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the Aoki et al. reference in light of the Yoshida et al. reference to arrive at the claimed ratio of 0.6 to 0.8 (i.e., 60-80%) because the Yoshida et al. references teaches away from using values above 50% as being inferior to those between 30 and 50%. For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this §103 rejection of independent Claim 6.

Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. in view of Yoshida et al. and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0030780 to Nishida et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 2-5 all depend from independent Claim 1, and therefore include all of the features of Claim 1, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this §103 rejection of dependent Claims 2-5 be withdrawn considering the above

remarks directed to independent Claim 1 and also because the Nishida et al. reference does not remedy the deficiencies noted above.

Claims 11, 12 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Aoki et al. in view of Yoshida et al. and further in view of United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0075436 to Kubo et al. Claim 11 has been cancelled, without prejudice, thereby rendering this rejection moot with respect to this claim. However, with regard to dependent Claims 12 and 15, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claims 12 and 15 all depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 1, and therefore include all of the features of Claim 1, plus additional features. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this §103 rejection of dependent Claims 12 and 15 be withdrawn considering the above remarks directed to independent Claim 1 and also because the Kubo et al. reference does not remedy the deficiencies noted above.

For all of the above reasons, Applicants request reconsideration and allowance of the claimed invention. Should the Examiner be of the opinion that a telephone conference

would aid in the prosecution of the application, or that outstanding issues exist, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By



James K. Folker

Registration No. 37,538

March 9, 2007

Suite 2500
300 South Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 360-0080

Customer No. 24978
P:\DOCS\1324\70174\BA8467.DOC